## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

## I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10-16 and 18-20 are currently pending in this application.

Claims 5, 16, and 20 are hereby amended. Claim 21 has been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been introduced. Changes to claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

## II. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, and 18-19 are allowable. Also, claims 5 and 20 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

## III. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, it is alleged that lines 3-6 of

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 212-588-0800 Customer No. 20999

U.S. Serial No. 10/525,634 Response to Office Action dated April 20, 2009

claim 11 is considered new matter. Applicants respectfully disagree. The feature "the movement vectors are located in the horizontal direction or in the vertical direction, the camera operation estimating means estimates them to be the panning operation or the tilting operation, respectively" as recited in claim 11, was included in claim 11, as originally filed. As stated in

MPEP, section 608.01(1):

Where subject matter not shown in the drawing or described in the description is claimed in the application as filed, and such original claim itself constitutes a clear disclosure of this subject matter, then the claim should be treated on its merits, and requirement made to amend the drawing and description to show this subject matter. The claim should not be attacked either by objection or rejection because this subject matter is lacking in the drawing and description. It is the drawing and description that are defective,

not the claim.

Moreover, support for this claim can be found on, for example, paragraphs [0050]-[0053] of Applicants published application. The previously made minor amendments to claim 11 addressed the Examiner's prior rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for an alleged lack of clarity. Thus, these minor amendments were administered for furthering grammatical clarity. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is, therefore, respectfully

requested.

Claims 5, 20, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 5 and 20 have been accordingly amended. With respect to claim 20, an antecedent basis for the terms "extracted image signal" is found on line 5 of claim 19 (i.e., "extracting the image signal") and line 5 of claim 21 (i.e., "extracting the image

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 212-588-0800

Customer No. 20999

U.S. Serial No. 10/525,634

Response to Office Action dated April 20, 2009

signal"), respectively. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are, therefore,

respectfully requested.

IV. CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

Claim 16 was rejected on the grounds that this claim is directed to non-statutory

subject matter. Claim 16 has been accordingly amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of

this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed

above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent

claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual

reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least

the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on

each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken

as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address

such comments.

Frommer Lawrence & Haug LLP 745 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10151 212-588-0800

Customer No. 20999

13 of 14 00659654

U.S. Serial No. 10/525,634 Response to Office Action dated April 20, 2009

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the

claims remaining in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early

passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above

with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that

the Examiner specifically indicate those portion or portions of the reference or references,

providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any

overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

Attorneys for Applicants

Thomas F. Presson Reg. No. 41,442 Ph: (212) 588-0800

Ph: (212) 588-0800 Fax: (212) 588-0500